

VZCZCXYZ0001  
RR RUEHWEB

DE RUEHNO #0181/01 0791515  
ZNY CCCCC ZZH  
R 201515Z MAR 07  
FM USMISSION USNATO  
TO RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC  
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 0648  
INFO RUEHZG/NATO EU COLLECTIVE  
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC  
RHMFISS/CDRUSAREUR HEIDELBERG GE  
RHMFISS/CDR USJFCOM NORFOLK VA  
RHMFISS/CDR USEUCOM VAIHINGEN GE  
RHMFISS/USNMR SHAPE BE  
ZEN/USDELMC BRUSSELS BE

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 000181

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

STATE FOR T, ISN (GODBY), EUR/RPM  
DEFENSE FOR OUSD POLICY (GREEN, STEIN, VEIT), OUSD  
ACQUISITION TECHNOLOGY AND LOGISTICS (HOPKINS, HENRY,  
HENNEGAN, DELANEY), JOINT STAFF/J-5 (CDR SWAIN), DEFENSE  
INTELLIGENCE AGENCY (UNGER), EUCOM FOR CS (MAJ GEN CATTO)  
AND ECJ5 (MAJ GEN REMKES)

E.O. 12958: DECL: 03/20/2017

TAGS: [MARR](#) [MCA](#) [MNUC](#) [NATO](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#)

SUBJECT: NATO SENIOR DEFENSE GROUP ON PROLIFERATION (DGP)  
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING, MAR 1, 2007

Classified By: DEFAD EVAN GALBRAITH FOR REASONS 1.4 (B&D)

11. (C) SUMMARY. On March 1, 2007, Ms. Laura Gross, Director, Counterproliferation Policy, OASD/GSA and Mr. Ivo Halak, Director of Strategic Planning Department, Czech Republic, co-chaired the Senior Defense Group on Proliferation Steering Committee (DGP-SC) meeting. The DGP-SC discussed Strengthening Host-Nation Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN) Defense Capabilities, Improved Coordination with other NATO Bodies, the 2006 North Atlantic Council (NAC) Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Seminar Report, 2006 NATO Field and Command Post Exercises, a Disease Surveillance System Capability, the upcoming meeting of the DGP with Ukraine, the next steps in the DGP meetings with Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), and NATO - European Union (EU) Cooperation in CBRN Defense. The next meeting will be in Plenary format on March 127.

-----  
DGP POLICY GUIDANCE  
-----

12. (C) The Committee considered first a presentation from the International Military Staff (IMS) on the subject of host-nation support. The presentation served to set the stage for a discussion of the topic of strengthening host-nation CBRN defense capabilities. The IMS provided an overview of key principles from the Comprehensive Political Guidance (CPG) and highlighted the importance of practical cooperation with national authorities. The IMS detailed how elements of the NATO Response Force (NRF) will arrive at deployed locations with all support needed for thirty days of operations; however, after this point forces will be reliant on the host-nation for some support (consumables, depending on the situation). Steps should be taken now to develop an Alliance Host-Nation Support (HNS) Concept that defines the key principles, roles, and responsibilities involved. This issue will also need to be extended for support to partners in the future. The HNS issue will certainly be considered when the CBRN Battalion CONOPS is reviewed. The command and control involved in logistics issues is one important area

that should receive attention.

13. (U) Following the IMS briefing, the UK introduced the subject of strengthening host-nation CBRN defense capabilities, a topic born of their experience in the Persian Gulf in 2003. A Food-for-Thought paper has been developed but not yet distributed. NATO should promote host-nation capabilities to respond to CBRN events and suggest ways to do this. The strategic context for this is contained in the Comprehensive Political Guidance (CPG) and MC511. Deployed forces are vulnerable and NATO will likely be reliant upon host-nation capabilities during extended operations. Nations were requested to review the discussion paper when received and to engage in the debate on how to carry this project further.

-----  
DGP AND NATO ACTIVITIES  
-----

14. (U) The DGP-SC addressed a working paper on Improved Coordination with other NATO Bodies. Following a break in silence by France to the fourth revision of the paper, the US Chair offered another compromise to address French concerns. The proposal suggested a two-phase approach in which the DGP Co-Chairs would host an informal meeting with the chairs of other NATO bodies involved in CBRN defense, to be followed by an ad-hoc workshop hosted by the International Staff (WMD Center) which would be open to all members of those committees, as well as DGP members. The Chairman highlighted the various documentation that supported her rationale for believing that hosting such a meeting was within the remit of the DGP and its work program. France provided rationale about the action being more appropriately led by the

International Staff, but agreed to seek guidance again from Paris on the new proposal. The working paper remains in-work and the proposed date for the initial informal meeting remains March 26.

15. (U) The Belgian delegate proposed that formal minutes of DGP-SC meetings be maintained and tabled a paper to that effect. According to Belgium, the procedure of issuing an action-list after each meeting--a practice that was introduced eighteen months ago--has been an improvement; but, more is needed. France supported the Belgian position but the UK tempered the argument by calling for new ways of doing business and a recognition of the workload implications of Belgium's proposal. The International Staff provided a rundown of the administrative rules of the house and proposed as an alternative to include as part of the action list any national position statements that were promptly submitted. This proposal achieved consensus and will be used following this DGP-SC.

-----  
TRAINING, EXERCISES, AND SEMINARS  
-----

16. (U) The U.S. co-chair coordinated numerous compromises on the latest version of the 2006 NAC WMD Seminar Report; among them, removing the recommendations from the report and suggesting that they instead be included in a Maritime Interdiction Food-for-Thought paper. Canada asked that the description of Maritime Situation Awareness (MSA) be moved to the Food-for-Thought paper as well. Wording was adjusted on "Intelligence" such that it can be accepted rather than collected, open sources as well as classified. Specific mention of SCEPC was replaced with reference to "other NATO bodies." A new revision of the paper has been placed into circulation for comment and will go under a silence procedure (through March 21).

17. (C) A briefing by the IMS covered the topic of NATO Field and Command Post Exercises. Six major exercises with CBRN events took place in 2006 and upcoming exercises in the NATO, JFC, and national series were mentioned. CBRN-related courses at the NATO School in Oberammergau were covered as

well. The challenges involved with ensuring adequate CBRN emphasis include improving cooperation with other NATO bodies and a growing number of partner nations. In addition, the lessons-learned process needs improvement, with emphasis on the ability to determine which, among the many events, actually do involve CBRN activity.

-----  
CAPABILITIES  
-----

¶18. (C) An IMS representative of the Chiefs of the Military Medical Services (COMEDS) provided an update report on the Disease Surveillance System (DSS). He reviewed the various reports to the DGP on this subject over the past few years and the history of relevant activity in the COMEDS. The DGP sees this system as one of the deliverables from the Prague Capability Initiative while the COMEDS considers it to be a work-in-progress under their remit, but with a broader scope under their Health Surveillance Structure. The COMEDS briefing explained the starting point of their work, the status of implementation at the moment, and their plan for future development. Analyses of data is expected to be available in 2008 and a full NATO capability is likely in 2010-2012. Nations were encouraged to support implementation of the DSS through the NATO force-goals process.

¶19. (U) A representative from the Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee (SCEPC) Joint Medical Committee informed the DGP-SC about a conference to be conducted in Halifax, 3-5 June, on the civil-military interface of the DSS. She announced that the DGP was invited to participate. The Head of the WMDC encouraged nations to consider attending as this

was a good opportunity for constructive exchange between the DGP and the SCEPC.

-----  
INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH  
-----

¶10. (C) The DGP-SC next discussed consultations with Ukraine. The co-chairs distributed a notional agenda for the upcoming 27 March meeting with Ukraine. The agenda and suggested areas for collaboration were derived from the 6-nation Food-for-Thought paper on cooperation with Ukraine in the area of CBRN defense, which was approved under a silence procedure on February 28. Three Ukrainian military officials are expected to participate in the March 27 meeting and their presentation will closely follow that given during the January Joint DGP-EAPC event. Two nations raised concerns about the composition of the Ukrainian delegation, indicating that representatives from the civilian political leadership should also be involved. Ukraine will be invited to consider attendance by civilian CBRN defense leadership, as well.

¶11. (U) The topic of DGP cooperation with the EAPC was discussed. The proceedings of the January meeting in EAPC format were reviewed and questions raised about possibilities for future meetings, for topics (e.g. Forensics, Environmental and Industrial Hazards, etc) and for locations. How to involve EAPC nations that do not normally participate was discussed and a proposal made that a suitable topic might be Host-Nation Support. A Tiger Team will be set up by the WMDC to work the issue and provide recommendations back to the Steering Committee at the April meeting.

¶12. (U) The last item under International Outreach was NATO cooperation with the European Union (EU). A Food-for-Thought paper on the subject was developed by ten interested nations and received general support at the meeting. The paper aims to investigate what has been accomplished to date with respect to CBRN defense cooperation, and proposes some steps for further cooperation on mutual issues. France found the paper interesting and offered some specific suggestions about the recommendation section of the paper. Several nations voiced caution about moving too quickly and advised revising the paper and allowing ample time for analysis and comment.

¶13. (U) The Co-Chairs reminded the group of meetings, including the upcoming informal Co-Chair meeting with Chairs of other NATO Bodies (March 26), the March DGP Plenary (March 27) and the DGP-Ukraine Dialogue (March 27).  
NULAND